

1.) Below are SST II RFP questions (Q) and answers (A):

	Final RFP Section	Paragraph	Question
Q1	C	1.2.2	Would the government please identify the existing off-the shelf sensor and motion hardware to be interfaced with image generation algorithms and techniques? Is the SST-II contractor responsible for maintaining or repairing the hardware or managing the maintenance agreement to send back to the vendor for repair?
A1			The existing off-the shelf sensor and motion hardware to be interfaced with image generation algorithms and techniques are 1. Ascension MotionStar; 2. USB Game Controllers; 3. JR3 Force/Torque sensors; and 4. Hytek Motor Controllers. All other systems (Charlotte mass-handling, helmets, and gloves) are not off-the-shelf, they were custom developed and built in-house. The SST II contractor will be responsible for maintaining and repairing the equipment/hardware.
Q2	C	1.3	Is the SST-II contractor responsible for maintaining or repairing the helmet mounted displays, motion and force feedback devices, mass handling robotic hardware in the loop, and sensor devices or managing the maintenance agreement to send back to the vendor for repair?
A2			The SST II contractor will be responsible for maintaining and repairing the equipment/hardware.
Q3			Is Trick available to offerors for evaluation purposes?
A3			Yes, Trick is available through the JSC Technology Transfer and Commercialization Office for evaluation purposes. The SST II technical library includes a User's Guide, a tutorial, and several training presentations for Trick.

Q4	C		There are multiple Software, Robotics and Simulation Division (SRSD) unique software products identified in the SOW, running under or integrated with Trick simulation environment. The Trick environment is a unique simulation run-time environment with unique, local to JSC, developer subject matter experts, developed over a span of 10 years+, with significant JSC investment, and a NASA owned product that can be obtained through licensing with the JSC's Technology Transfer and Commercialization Office. How many commercially licensed Trick versions exist? Will the government require the SST-II contractor to maintain Trick software versions for commercially licensed versions of Trick?
A4			Currently, there are no special commercial only releases of Trick. The Government will require the SST II contractor to maintain current Trick versions and make them available through the JSC Technology Transfer and Commercialization Office.
Q5	H.2	(a),(b), (c)	Request JSC delete entire H.2 clause: "This effort requires support to the insight and oversight functions of the ISS, Commercial Crew and MPCV Orion Project and its contractor developed products." This clause unnecessarily restricts competition. The ISS, Commercial Crew, and MPCV Orion are past Critical Design. SST-II has no Certification of Flight Readiness (CoFR) requirements. Contract products are used for analysis and training. Proprietary and confidential data access can be managed by the ACA's listed in H.9. It is difficult to see how any contractor at JSC with experience would want to jeopardize any future competitions.
A5			The Government has reviewed clause H.2 and has determined the clause to be necessary. Offeror's shall submit an Organizational Conflict of Interest (OCI) Plan in accordance with L.21.6 (b).
Q6	L.21.3	2	Would the government consider modifying the "... contracts with performance within 3 years from date of solicitation ..." to "... contracts with performance within 5 years from date of solicitation..."?

A6			The Government has determined that contracts with performance within 3 years from date of solicitation is more relevant to the SST II effort.
Q7	L.21.3	7	Would the government consider modifying the “over the past 3 years on work... to “over the past 5 years on work...”?
A7			The Government has determined that contracts with performance within 3 years from date of solicitation is more relevant to the SST II effort.
Q8	L.21.3	8	Would the government consider modifying the statement: “Each Offeror and major subcontractor shall provide copies of any Quality Management system (QMS) certifications it has received elsewhere in the past 3 years” to Each Offeror and major subcontractor shall provide copies of any Quality Management system (QMS) certifications no later than 6 months after award.
A8			The Government has reviewed the mentioned statement and has determined that receiving the certifications after award will not allow the Government to perform an adequate evaluation of the Offeror's Quality Management System (QMS) therefore, the requirement will remain as is.
Q9	L.21.3	9	Would the government consider deleting this paragraph in past performance volume? Export Control Experience relative to “work comparable to the SOW requirements” provides significant past performance advantage to the incumbent. Based on Section M’s definition of Mission suitability + Past Performance > Cost. The Export Control section in the Program management Plan DRD 3 and Section H Export licensing appear to be sufficient for evaluation of Mission Suitability.
A9			The Government has reviewed the Export Control Experience paragraph of L.21.3, Past Performance and is in the process of the amending the solicitation to modify the reference paragraph.
Q10	L,M	Pg. L-19, M-5; Para: MA4 in each section	REFERENCE: The Offeror shall provide in Volume I their Overall Management approach for fulfilling all contract requirements in accordance with the JSC Quality Management System and shall ensure work

			<p>involving this contract performed off-site is in accordance with SAE AS9100.</p> <p>QUESTION: Section L.17 on page L-11 and L-12 states that "The current plan for the SSTII contractor is to use existing facilities on-site at JSC for personnel who will directly support the accomplishment of this contract.</p> <p>Therefore, a Quality System does not appear to be a requirement to be delivered with the Proposal. However, on page M-5, as part of the Management Approach evaluation, it appears to indicate a system would be evaluated. Suggest this evaluation requirement be deleted from paragraph M.6.1 and paragraph 3.0 of Section C. Does the Government agree?</p>
A10			<p>The current plan for the SST II contractor is to use existing facilities on-site at JSC for personnel who directly support the accomplishment of this contract however, the requirement for a Quality System is required in the event work under SST II is needed to be performed offsite.</p>
Q11	L.19	Pg: L-13; Para: Table L-3	<p>REFERENCE: Table L-3 indicates that all of Volume VI, Eligibility Considerations, will be included in the page count.</p> <p>QUESTION: Volume VI contains five items that include information about an offeror's business and accounting systems, OCI info, a FAR clause waiver, and the IT Security Management Program. These items represent standard administrative requirements, similar to those required in Volume V and for other non-page counted administrative requirements in the RFP. We request that Volume VI be removed from the page count. Does the Government agree?</p>
A11			<p>The Government has reviewed the information requested under each Volume and has made a determination that a page limit of 250 pages is sufficient.</p>

Q12	M	Pg: M-7, M-13; Para: M.6.2, M.6.5	REFERENCE: In M.6.2, the last statement in the paragraph states "Failure to capture proposal efficiencies and innovations in the model contract may result in loss of mission suitability points." However in para. M.6.5, pg M-13, the first statement says "The model contract will not be evaluated for selection purposes. QUESTION: Can the Government please clarify this apparent inconsistency between these two statements in Section M.
A12			The Government has clarified the inconsistency between the two mentioned statements in Section M. The Government is in the process of amending paragraph M.6.2 of the SST II solicitation to read: "Failure to capture proposal efficiencies and innovations in accordance with DRD 4, Technical Efficiencies and Innovations Proposed SOW Language, may result in loss of mission suitability points."
Q13	L	Pg: L-37; Para: Compensation Template a)	REFERENCE: The "Escalation rates for year 2-5" column shall include your annual escalation percentage. QUESTION: To provide for a fair and equitable evaluation, we request that the Government provide the escalation rates for years 2-5. Does the Government agree?
A13			The offeror is responsible in determining escalation rates for their employees. This is based upon the offeror's management and technical approach. The offeror is also required to provide rationale for their proposed escalation rates.
Q14	L	Pg: Cost Templates, Attachment L- 09; Para: IDIQ Summary Cost Template; L.21.2, TA1 Specific Technical Understanding	REFERENCE: In the Example in the spreadsheet the Government uses 1860 labor hours as the number of productive hours per Full Time Equivalent (FTE). QUESTION: So that FTE estimates for the Basis of Estimates and the Cost model are comparable across all offerors for Government evaluation, is it correct for Offerors to assume that we should use 1860 productive labor hours to ensure Offerors use the equivalent number of hours? If not correct, then what number of productive labor hour should Offerors use to represent 1 FTE?

A14			It is not correct to assume that all offerors use 1860 productive labor hours in estimating task order costs. The offeror shall determine their own productive hours. It is possible to have offerors with different productive factors based upon their own estimating systems. This shall also take into consideration the productive hours as a team if major subcontractors are proposed. The goal is to have a composite set of productive hours as a team determined by the prime offeror.
------------	--	--	---

SST II RFP Document Change Log

<u>Page(s)</u>	<u>RFP Reference</u>	<u>Change(s)</u>	<u>Question Number</u>
L-28	L.21.3, para. 9	Deleted the following sentence in its entirety: "Offerors and major subcontractors shall identify activities, processes, and issues used to address export control for work comparable to the SOW requirements."	Q9
L-42	L.21.6, para. (a)	Corrected the FAR reference to read: "FAR 9.104-1"	
M-2	M.4, para. 3	Inserted the following sentence at the end of paragraph 3: "Past Performance is more important than cost."	Preproposal Conference Question and Answers 1.)
M-7	M.6.2, para 2 (TA1)	Changed last sentence of paragraph 2 to read: "Failure to capture proposed efficiencies and innovations in accordance with DRD 4, Technical Efficiencies and Innovations Proposed SOW Language, may result in loss of mission suitability points."	Q12
Attachment L-09, Cost Proposal Template	Fully Burdened Rates Template (FBR)	Revised the FBR template of Attachment L-09, Cost Proposal Template to remove the reference to Firm Fixed Price for Contract Years 3, 4, and 5.	

modifier, including the state formula used for the computation, along with the loss ratio for each of the past three years (where the loss ratio is defined as the ratio of losses to premium). Show all figures used for computation.

- A letter from the insurance carrier summarizing the Offeror's liability and lawsuit history related to safety and health performance for the past three years including a history of changes to the experience modifier rate. If an Offeror self-insures, provide and certify the same information (except the experience modifier rate history) with the signature of the responsible corporate officer or official.

(7) **Small Business Past Performance**

The prime Offeror shall provide a statement of small business participation (targets, record, and type of work subcontracted) over the last 3 years on work that is relevant to this effort, with special emphasis on the division of the company which will perform the proposed contract.

(8) **Quality System Experience**

Each Offeror and major subcontractor shall provide copies of any Quality Management System (QMS) certifications it has received elsewhere in the past 3 years. A statement shall be made regarding any changes of registrars, loss of registration status in the past 3 years.

(9) **Export Control Experience**

Offerors and major subcontractors are to provide a summary of their past export control experience and current export control processes they have in place. Offerors and major subcontractors shall identify all export control violations occurring during the past 3 years.

(End of provision)

L.21.4 Volume IV, Cost/Price Evaluation Factor

Instructions for Preparation of the Cost Proposal

Certified cost and pricing data is not required; however, other than cost and pricing data is required. To ensure that the Government is able to perform a fair assessment of the proposed cost, each Offeror is required to submit a cost proposal that is suitable for evaluation. A cost volume that is suitable for evaluation shall:

- a. Account for all resources necessary to complete requirements of this RFP.
- b. Provide traceability to the technical/management proposal(s).
- c. Explain in detail all pricing and estimating techniques.

L.21.6 Volume VI, Eligibility Considerations**(a) Business Systems Adequacy**

FAR 16.104(i), Factors in Selecting Contract Type, and FAR 16.301-3, Limitations, requires that a contractor's accounting system be adequate for determining costs applicable to the contract prior to the award of a cost- reimbursement contract. The Offeror shall provide evidence of an adequate accounting system as determined by the Government for determining costs applicable to the contract. A contract may only be awarded to an Offeror who is determined to have an adequate accounting system.

Other business systems general standards are discussed in FAR 9.104-1, General Standards. The Offeror shall state whether all business systems, including but not limited to accounting, property control, purchasing, estimating, project reporting, and employee compensation, which require Government acceptance or approval (as applicable), are currently accepted/approved by DCAA, without condition. Provide the date of acceptance/approval for each applicable system and the cognizant contract administration office. Explain any existing conditional acceptances/approvals and the compliance status of any system(s) for which acceptance or approval is currently withheld.

(b) Organizational Conflict of Interest (OCI) Information

In accordance with FAR Subpart 9.5, Organizational and Consultant Conflicts of Interest, the offeror and proposal will be reviewed for existing and potential OCI issues in relation to this procurement. The offeror shall submit the information required by the OCI Avoidance Plan DRD-8.

(c) Waiver of Rights to Inventions

This solicitation contains NASA FAR Supplement (NFS) Clause 1852.227-70, "New Technology" and NFS provision 1852.227-71, "Request for Waiver to Rights to Inventions". Any petitions for advance (prior to contract execution) waiver of rights to inventions should be included in this volume.

(d) Cost Accounting Standards

State whether the Cost Accounting Standards (CAS) Disclosure Statement represented in Provision K.2, Cost Accounting Standards Notices and Certifications, has been approved by the cognizant

M.3 AWARD WITHOUT DISCUSSIONS

The proposals will be evaluated in accordance with procedures prescribed by the FAR and the NFS. As prescribed in the FAR 52.215-1, the Government intends to award based on initial proposals, without discussions. Therefore, the Offeror's initial proposal should contain the Offeror's best terms. The Government reserves the right to determine if discussions are required and if so, an establishment of a competitive range may be necessary. Consequently, the most highly rated proposals will be included in the competitive range.

(End of Provision)

M.4 EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

An initial review of proposals will be conducted to determine acceptability of the proposals in accordance with NASA FAR Supplement (NFS) 1815.305-70, Identification of Unacceptable Proposals. All unacceptable proposals will be eliminated from further evaluation.

Proposals will be evaluated by the Source Evaluation Board (SEB) in accordance with applicable regulations which include the Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) and the NASA FAR Supplement. The SEB will carry out the evaluation activities and report its findings to the Source Selection Authority (SSA) who is responsible for making the source selection decision.

The Government will award a contract resulting from this solicitation to the responsible Offeror whose proposal represents the best value to the Government. This procurement shall be conducted utilizing a combination of mission suitability, past performance and cost/price evaluation factors. The lowest price proposals may not necessarily receive an award; likewise, the highest technically rated proposals may not necessarily receive an award. Mission Suitability and Past Performance when combined are more important than cost. Mission Suitability is more important than past performance. Past Performance is more important than cost.

The Government will evaluate the Offeror's proposal using the factors and subfactors below. Although proposals are organized by factors and subfactors, the Government will conduct an integrated evaluation to consider consistency among proposal information.

this information should conform to its submitted Small Business Subcontracting Plan. For small business Offerors, NASA will evaluate this only if subcontracting opportunities exist.)

SA1 Safety and Health Plan Subfactor 4 – The Offeror's Safety and Health Plan will be evaluated for overall demonstrated understanding, effectiveness, feasibility, efficiency, and completeness.

(End of provision)

M.6.2 Overall Technical Approach (TA) - Mission Suitability Subfactor 2

The offeror's demonstrated in-depth understanding of the requirements (with supporting rationale) will be evaluated in Technical Approach subfactor element as described below.

TA1. Specific Technical Understanding and Resources - The Government will evaluate the offeror's Specific Technical Understanding and Resources response for overall demonstrated comprehensive understanding, effectiveness, feasibility, efficiency, innovation and consistency. For any proposed improvements, innovations, and efficiencies, the Government will evaluate the appropriateness and its potential for effective and efficient implementation in the contract. Failure to capture proposed efficiencies and innovations in accordance with DRD 4, Technical Efficiencies and Innovations Proposed SOW Language, may result in loss of mission suitability points.

M.6.3 Past Performance Factor

Past Performance indicates how well an Offeror performed on earlier work and can be a significant indicator of how well it can be expected to perform the work at hand. The Offeror's past performance will be evaluated by the SEB.

The Government will use past performance information from proposal data required by provisions of Section L, information obtained by the SEB team based on communications with listed references, as well as data independently obtained from other government and commercial sources, such as the Past Performance Information Retrieval System and similar systems of

FULLY BUREAUCRATED RATES TEMPLATE (FRN)									
Prime Contractor		[] Contract Year 1							
Major Subcontractor		[] Contract Year 2							
		[] Contract Year 3							
		[] Contract Year 4							
		[] Contract Year 5							
Prime Contractor completes this form before the FRN									
Prime Contractor to use Schedule 1000									
Schedule 1000 (Required Item by prime)									
Division	MSA	Incident	Director	Owner	Owner	GLA	GR		Contract
Labor Category	Standard Labor Category (SLC)	Percentage %	Rate	Rate	Cost	Rate	Cost	FEET/HR	Prime Hourly Rate
Example			75%	28.5	5%	2.95	6%	3.02	53.0
0722			25%	25.5	5%	18.94	6%	2.65	46.8
		100%	27.88	5%	20.3	6%	2.83	-	51.7
MAJOR SUBCONTRACTOR STOPS HERE & PROVIDES PRN TO PRIME									
SL Program Manager									
Project Manager									
Admin Specialist									
Business Specialist									
SL Eng I									
SL Eng II									
SL Eng VI									
SL Eng V									
General Svc									
General Svc									
Principal Eng I									
Principal Eng II									
Principal Eng V									
Principal Eng VI									
Other (omit)									
This field includes the major subcontractor's complete breakdown rates per SLC. DO NOT include subcontractors or proposed details for items not requested in the complete. The Prime Contractor may apply a labor rate to the major subcontractor's PRN if applicable.									
This field includes the prime subcontractor's complete breakdown rates per SLC. The field must be filled in Section 5 of the contract.									
DO NOT INCLUDE PRN IN THIS FIELD. PRN TO BE PROVIDED BY PRN TO PRIME									